



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

largely tabular and that Historical Grammar has been reduced to a minimum. Let us note in passing that *redēdi=redēdidi* (§§ 338-1 and 342-2) is not a weak perfect, and that the 2 p. pl. pres. ind. and sub. of the inchoative verbs of the second weak conjugation (§§ 339 and 340) apparently ends in *-ez*; not *fenissiez*, but *fenissez*.

The book ends with an Appendix containing three short passages of French, one from each period, in phonetic transcription. Examination reveals the fact that Professor Luquiens believes in the absoluteness of phonetic law not only in isolated words, but also in stress group. In consequence these lines contain many notations which it would be difficult to defend. How could it be proved that final consonants before a word beginning with a consonant were silent in the *Roland*, that final *t* in *devant* became *d* before *lui*, that *Apollin reclaimet* was pronounced *apōlānd rēklāimēt* and *mals ne māu nē?* Phonetic theory is certainly carried to its limit here, and the explanations which follow on p. 144 only serve to emphasize this first impression.

This review should not close without pointing out certain excellent features of the little book. Its style is clear and comprehensible, the Glossary of technical terms, pp. 20-22, should be useful, and there are many small additions here and there which shed clearer light on difficult problems. While I doubt the advisability of teaching of Old French Grammar in this way, it is not impossible that students insufficiently familiar with German may find here a useful commentary provided, however, that they will keep the Schwan-Behrens Grammar constantly open before them.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

SCHILLER, SEIN LEBEN UND SEINE WERKE, von Karl Berger, In zwei Bänden, Zweiter Band. 812 pp., 1909.

With the appearance of the final volume of Berger's *Life of Schiller* the evil spell which has seemed hitherto to prevent the completion of a biography on a worthy scale of the best loved of the German dramatic poets is at last broken.

J. Minor's attempted "Life" remains a fragment at the end of the second volume, while its style as well as its exhaustiveness must have prevented it from becoming an interpreter of the poet to the masses, however imposing and authoritative it might have proved to the scholar and investigator. Weltrich's great work is

still unfinished, and probably is destined to share the same fate, and remain a torso. It, too, if completed, could scarcely become the definitive Schiller biography, certainly not the final one, for it likewise fails to keep the golden mean between too much and too little. Otto Brahm's Schiller biography might, with due apologies, be mentioned in this connection, because it also remains a fragment. The age of its earlier portions and the spirit out of which it grew render it unsatisfactory to present day students.

Other "Lives" had all proved inadequate for one reason or another, or had outlived their day of usefulness. The great problem remained unsolved, of producing an account of Schiller's life and works, in their origin and development, with their content and influence, that would be adequate in fulness but not overburdened with minute discussion of minor matters or analyses that render the works themselves unnecessary, popular in form and appeal, yet sound in every respect and taking due account of what investigation of various phases of the poet's career and works has established in recent years down to date of going to press.

The success of Bielschowsky's *Life of Goethe* naturally awakened a desire to see as happy treatment of his great companion poet, and few works of a like nature were ever expected more eagerly by scholar and public alike, than Berger's Schiller biography, when it was known, that both author and publisher proposed to make it a worthy companion piece to the former.

The appearance of the first volume in 1905 seemed to fulfill that promise in every respect. The style was certainly delightful, though a little unequal in some portions, and scholars in general agreed that the presentation of facts was exceptionally sound, and the perspective right. The elements of importance were given due prominence, and the details, while full, were not obtruded on the attention in such fashion as to distort the conception of the life as a whole.

Unfortunately, as a result of the attempt to divide a life of three well marked periods into two logical parts, that volume closed with Schiller's entrance upon his career in Jena. Not only the period of his mature works, but the whole decade of preparation for them, the most important period in his life and the one most likely to receive inadequate treatment at the hands of a popular biographer,—the crux of any *Life of Schiller*,—was left to a second volume. Judgment as to the final value of Berger's work, whether it should prove to be the definitive biography, or at least the standard for years to come, had to be suspended in the meantime.

At length, after several years of delay beyond the term first set, the second and final volume has appeared, and the German

speaking world has a biography of its greatest dramatic poet, which on the whole fulfills the demands of an adequate "Life" and does not disappoint in any essential feature the expectations raised by the first volume.

The first naturally challenged comparisons with its predecessors, particularly Minor's and Weltrich's works, but also with Brahm's and the briefer popular works. Of Berger's work we may briefly say, that it used with fulness all essential data presented, but was more critical and cautious in following Minor than Weltrich. The second volume has the field more clearly to itself. There is no real competitor in point of fulness of treatment, for Brahm's second volume does not even finish the analysis of the aesthetic essays, and leaves the classic plays and Schiller's whole connection with the Weimar theater untouched.

Of recent attempts to present Schiller's career as a whole in moderate compass we naturally compare with Berger's Kühnemann's and Thomas' biographies.

Kühnemann's interesting work, of course, can never become the standard biography, because of its frank intention to treat the works with unequal fulness and because of its general viewpoint. It is stimulating, to be sure, to see the poet and his art principles, in youth and in maturity, illuminated by Kühnemann from the two great eminences, "Die Räuber" and "Wallenstein," and to look at the man and the poet, not so much to discover what he was and how he became such, but to estimate his value to us now, but that is not the function of biography proper. Berger's purpose is to show us not only the man, but his works, not only the poet in his value for the present generation, but in his achievements for his own age, his significance historically as well as absolutely. Every thing is brought to light that can serve this purpose. Every fact of any importance in the brief life of the poet, which the latest investigations have brought to light or established, is used to complete the picture of the man. Brief sketches of his friends, some account of the dominant interests of the different circles with which he was associated, and the relation of all to general historical, literary, and philosophical movements, help the reader to a better appreciation of the milieu of the poet, and therefore to a better understanding of his remarkable career. Such sketches occur in Bd. I, Kap. 9, the literary movement in Swabia; in Bd. II, Kap. 24, the academic life and conditions at Jena; in Bd. I, Kap. 18, characterization of Körner and Leipzig friends; Bd. II, Kap. 32, of Fichte, Humboldt, Goethe; Bd. II, Kap. 34, of the Schlegels; etc., etc.

However the milieu is not overemphasized. The better viewpoint is taken throughout, that the personality, the inborn genius, is ultimately unexplainable, a datum to be accepted. A biog-

raphy has to narrate the unfolding of this personality in all its relations, its interaction with other personalities and external modifying forces, its accomplishments in word and work. Heredity will not explain all, nor will the artist's milieu, nor specifically, the literary influences. Berger gives us these in ample fulness, but everywhere he is more concerned with the fundamental character and genius of Schiller, which gradually but surely comes into its own in a struggle against adverse conditions, poverty, tyranny, want of appreciation, and last and heaviest, disease and its constant interruption of his plans.

But far more than the mere externally uneventful life are the works. Schiller's life is preeminently the progressive embodiment of himself in his works. Hence the great bulk of this biography is devoted to the latter. Every scrap of his productions is considered and placed in its true relation to his unfolding career. Every work, small or great, is analyzed more or less fully and its content noted. Berger, in fact, does not presuppose on the reader's part a large acquaintance with Schiller's works. He rather assumes an acquaintance with only several of the greater masterpieces, such as may be reckoned upon among *Gymnasiasten* and the general cultured public. Hence the carefulness to give full and sufficient insight into the message and meaning of everything the poet produced.

In the treatment of every phase of Schiller's life Berger shows a generous, sympathetic attitude toward his subject. Not a blind worshipper of every word, yet a lover of the poet's personality in all its expressions, he is able to see that the historical works are out of date, and displaced by better treatises based on fuller facts and produced in accordance with better methods, without condemning them as worthless and lacking interest. Thomas' rather flippant and cavalier way of hustling the historical works out of sight with a shrug of the shoulders and a curl of the lip, is in marked contrast with the recognition which Berger gives them from the point of view of their purpose, the available data, the customary mode of history writing at that time, the power of presentation of historic movements, and their art value today. The wide range of Schiller's interests in his lectures on history at Jena is brought out clearly.

Also in marked contrast with Thomas is the treatment of the philosophical studies and the aesthetic treatises that grew out of them. One feels at every turn that Thomas made his acquaintance with Schiller through the medium of that school which constantly exalted Goethe at the expense of Schiller, who, having formed a conviction that philosophy and poetry are mutually exclusive things, condemn and regret the years spent by the poet in mastering the Kantian system. Thomas waves most of the

aesthetic works aside with a word or two and an assurance that they are without interest to readers nowadays and of but slight importance for the appreciation of the poet's great creations. He even unkindly magnifies into the chief motive for their production the poet's need of money to make ends meet. One need only consider Schiller's refusal of Cotta's flattering offers of the editorship of a political journal to be convinced that money considerations were never dominant in any of his serious work. These essays were not mere pot-boilers, as Berger and Kühnemann rightly agree, but as much an expression of Schiller's genius as any other of his works. They represent a necessary stage in the development of a fundamentally philosophic personality, which was also endowed with marvelous powers of imagination. We might almost as well brand the classic dramas pot-boilers because the poet tried to market them to the best advantage for the support and security of his family.

In accordance with this better view, this recognition of the legitimacy and value of the philosophic studies, Berger devotes seventy-five pages of his "Life" to a clear characterization of Schiller's views and an expository analysis of all his essays. Like Kühnemann, Berger finds Schiller essentially Kantian, but is careful to emphasize the fact that Schiller was particularly inclined by character and previous thinking to be affected by the new and revolutionary doctrines which had just come from Königsberg. We do not have the conquest of an unwilling mind, or the temporary and superficial adoption of a system which happened at that time to be in the ascendancy, but the final clarification of a way of thinking fundamentally allied, yet different in certain important respects. The conquest of Schiller's mind, so far as was possible, by Kant's philosophy, or shall we rather say Schiller's conquest and assimilation of Kant's system so far as it furthered himself as a man and artist, is carefully and clearly sketched by Berger, and the moral and aesthetic differences of the poet from his master brought out. Whether Kühnemann and Berger do not go too far in identifying Schiller's thought with Kant's, is a question that will be answered differently by different thinkers. The present writer misses somewhat an emphatic recognition of Schiller's contribution to the solution of the ethical and the aesthetic problem. Doubtless Schiller remains generally within legitimate deductions from Kant's fundamental principles, but Kant himself felt and insisted upon the marked difference between his view of moral action and that of Schiller's "schöne Seele," and Schiller's attempt to find a criterion of objective beauty is certainly an advance upon Kant. But with this slight reserve, that may represent only a personal impression, Berger's chapter is to be praised as an excellent presentation of Schiller's development as a philosophic thinker,

and of his views as set forth in each and all of his essays. His style is not quite so crisp as Kühnemann's, but is clear and uniform and readable, which is important in so difficult a portion of a biography intended for popular use.

Likewise, the frank acceptance of the so-called reflective poetry as a genuine type of lyrical expression, and the equally patent desire to see and interpret the poet as he was, makes Berger's chapter on Schiller's "*Gedankenlyrik*" a notable one. Though a product of transition from the aesthetic studies to his serious occupation with "*Wallenstein*" it is not necessarily a mere by-product of his genius. The half apologetic tone of Thomas, the ascription of unripeness and partial validity to them, as transition products, by Kühnemann in his interesting rapid sketch, are replaced here by the warmest recognition. Of course, for those who exclude philosophic poetry from the realm of valid art, Schiller's lyrics of this period will appear only brilliant rhetoric and keen didactic. This Berger admits, though he insists that the difficulty is rather with the narrow definition of lyric art than with Schiller. Quoting with approval Dilthey's category of lyric poetry, in which a content that reaches out beyond and above the personal destiny of the soul, takes hold of it and completely determines its mood, Berger adds: "In this kind of lyric Schiller's mastery is incontestable, his imperial greatness unmatched. His philosophical poems shine with unwonted splendor as rare jewels among the crown treasures of German poetry, and the whole world, according to the judgment of the best critics, can present nothing equal in rank with these lyrics, so rich in meaning and at the same time so noble in form." As a counterpart of this high estimate, Berger rightly emphasizes the fact that Schiller's lyric field is not wide. Love lyrics, nature lyrics, which some consider the only true lyrics, were not his field. In general, Berger's chapter gives the fullest, warmest, and at the same time sane and thoughtful appreciation which this part of Schiller's art product has yet received. In the same spirit the long series of ballads and the "*Glockenlied*" are analyzed and judged.

The chapter devoted to "*Wallenstein*" is an excellent essay on the genesis of the play and the struggle of the poet to master the chaotic materials, and in fulness, accuracy, and clearness, leaves little to be wished. The analysis of the play by Acts affects one at first reading as a little pedantic, and Kühnemann's treatment may be more satisfying because freer formally, but the writer is attempting at the same time to make clear the relations of the parts of the two dramas, the "*Piccolomini*" and "*Wallenstein's Tod*" when considered, as they always should be, and as Schiller intended them, as making one single drama. One is ready to withdraw all charge of pedantry, however, on compar-

ing a few pages of Frick's "Wegweiser" devoted to the same subject.

What one might rather offer as a criticism is this noticeable fact: Berger rightly insists that a full understanding of Schiller's historical and aesthetic studies are of prime importance for the appreciation of his classic dramas, most of which have their source in historic events, which have been elaborated in a sovereign manner in accordance with the demands of his aesthetic system; and his readers would never have pardoned him if he had given too slight attention to those chapters. Now, in this sketch of the poet's years of difficulty and endeavor to master the mass of historical materials and transform them into a suitable tragic subject, as well as in the analysis of the play itself, everywhere the chief emphasis is laid upon the play as it is, the characters as they appear in the play, the actions as the poet presents them. Nowhere do we see, except in the most general fashion, how the poetic genius transforms his raw materials. With a few words and the introduction here and there of a few specific instances of the poet's transformations with their reasons, the whole artistic process might have been made luminous. However what is given is very full and excellent.

The chapter on the friendship with Goethe offers another point for comparison, not only with the other Schiller biographers, but with Bielschowsky's "Goethe," the model of Berger's work, which necessarily treats the same subject. All recite the same facts, but the personal viewpoint and individual style varies greatly. Bielschowsky emphasizes in a succession of sharp antitheses the differences between Goethe and Schiller, and assumes that their firm friendship rested upon the complementary character of these differences. Berger, less brilliantly perhaps but more fully portrays these differences, but insists that they kept the poets apart until the development of both toward a common ground of meeting reduced the contrasts to a narrow enough margin to permit a lasting union. Berger rightly agrees with Kühnemann, that the friendship rests primarily, not on complementary contrasts, but upon fundamental unity of view concerning art, which was the highest interest of both. Their differences could supplement each other, only because the poets were approaching from opposite paths a predominant unity of view and interest.

Of the biography as a whole it may be said, that it has no new discoveries to present and champion with partisan warmth, as Bielschowsky's work had. It makes use of the whole contribution of Schiller's scholarship to date, and is generally reliable to the slightest detail. Careful comparison, when in doubt, generally confirms the view presented.

In one particular, however, which occurred to the writer, the language might be misleading. When Berger remarks that "durch Veruntreuung" the English translation by Coleridge appeared too early, etc., the language seems to imply a charge of malversation against the English translator. It is probably true that the English publisher, Bell, to whom Schiller gladly sold the right of translation and publication, and for whom he prepared accurate copies of his manuscripts, found himself unable to carry out his part of the agreement, and, considering himself seized of the rights of translation and publication, resolved to dispose of them, as he would of any other property, to another publisher, who might handle the enterprise. Longmans, to whom the transfer was made, were already Coleridge's publishers, and knowing him to be a poet of rare ability, and one of the few able German scholars in England, offered him fifty pounds to translate it. Coleridge was distressed financially at all times, and therefore ready to take any offer. And thus it all came about, and it is well for Schiller that his work fell into so good hands. That Schiller had difficulty in securing the sum agreed upon by Bell is readily understood from the fact that the edition was a failure and Longmans lost money on the venture. Bell, and the lax notions of the age concerning literary property, were probably the only source of the difficulty. A slight change of wording could remove from Berger's statement all ground of misunderstanding.

Berger also makes use of the famous letter of Fr. v. Schimmelmann in the text in discussing the relations of Schiller to Goethe. In the notes, however, he calls attention to L. Geiger's attempt to prove it ungenune. Geiger may be correct in his surmises, but few will be persuaded that the views contained in that letter are not those of Schiller himself, whoever may have pieced out the letter for publication, as Geiger will have it.

An excellent "Register" makes the contents of both volumes readily accessible for consultation.

All in all, this biography of Schiller is the best in all respects that the German people possess, the fullest and sanest, thoroughly reliable, with just perspective, and written with warm admiration for the genius of the poet, and clear insight into the personality of the man.

In closing we can only express the wish that some translator and some American or English publisher might be idealistic enough to make this work as accessible to the English speaking contingency of Schiller's admirers, as Bielschowsky's "Goethe" now is; for at present we are not in possession of an English biography which renders another either unnecessary or undesirable.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL.

University of Michigan.